

Quid Novi

VOL. VIII NO.9

MCGILL UNIVERSITY FACULTY OF LAW
FACULTE DE DROIT DE L'UNIVERSITE MCGILL

November 9, 1987
le 9 novembre, 1987

RENÉ LÉVESQUE: LE BEAU RISQUE

François Cossette

NOV 13 1987

est avec consternation, comme frappés
une profonde stupeur, que nous appren-
ns à la fin d'un weekend d'octobre (un
week-end d'octobre qui nous rappelait 1970
ors que la mort de Pierre Laporte avait
rocement assombri le Québec) la mort d'un
and homme, d'une partie de nous-même,
l'incarnation du désir politique d'un pe-
ple né de l'après-guerre, la mort de celui
e l'on croyait immortel tant son image se
nfondait avec l'histoire du peuple dont il
nanait.

u d'hommes dans l'histoire du Québec
ront su assumer le lourd fardeau d'inspirer
s générations d'hommes et de femmes
omme il a su le faire avec un humilité
concertante et une honnêteté qui a désarmé
us d'une fois ses adversaires. Lévesque fut
innovateur dans tout ce qu'il a entrepris.
enant de lui n'importe quel plan d'attaque
vêtait l'allure d'un beau risque, d'un coup
enter. Sa passion de l'action et des résultats
onna le ton à la grande marche du Québec
rs la modernisation.

sa voix tremblante, il fut le premier re-
rtter à révéler au monde occidental la mort
Mussolini, l'atrocité des camps de con-
centrations et la poussée libératrice des
nées alliées en sol européen. Il fut aussi le

premier à exploiter adéquatement
l'instrument de la télévision, permettant
ainsi à l'homme ordinaire de comprendre
l'actualité internationale jadis réservée à une
élite, tout en affaiblissant la dure carapace
xénophobe et isolationniste d'un Québec
obscurci par le duplessisme. En somme, il
travailla avec acharnement à l'accession de
l'actualité politique au rang de célébration
médiatique pour ensuite en devenir l'une des
vedettes principales. Il ne fait aucun doute
que sa montée doit être étroitement associée
au développement des médias et
spécifiquement à l'évolution du journalisme
électronique. Il en fut les meilleurs acteur et
metteur en scène.

Dès son entrée en politique, il comprit très
vite le rôle fondamental de l'hydro-élec-
tricité dans le développement industriel du
Québec et dans ce contexte, l'élection de
1962 avec les risques et les obstacles qu'elle
comportait fut probablement son plus grand
exploit. René Lévesque avait deux passions:
la politique et le poker. Or l'élection de 1962
lui permettait de jouer les deux à la fois.
D'une part, il demandait la remise en ques-
tion d'une victoire acquise de justesse (celle
de 1960) et de ce fait celle de tout le projet de
la révolution tranquille au profit d'un seul
aspect du programme. Et d'autre part, il
parvenait à convaincre son parti de sauter
avec lui, malgré le risque de dissension pro-
fonde qui le guettait, la controverse énorme

que soulevait le projet et la possibilité de
s'aliéner l'establishment économique. Nul
doute qu'une défaite à ce moment précis
aurait profondément modifié le cours de
l'histoire du Québec. La même audace se
manifestait à nouveau en 1967, lors de sa
rupture fracassante avec le parti libéral, rup-
ture qui devait mener à la fondation du Parti
Québécois en 1968. La vie entière de
Lévesque est faite de coups de force,
marquée par un sens de l'action fébrile,
teintée par un non-conformisme attachant.

Quelques jours avant sa mort, il avait ren-
contré Trudeau et Pelletier à l'occasion
d'une foire littéraire et il avait blagué en
voyant Trudeau marcher à l'aide d'une
canne mais au fond, il n'avait peut-être pas
envie de vieillir impuissant, diminué, main-
tenu en vie par le respirateur de ses exploits
passés. Alors, il s'est éclipsé un dimanche de
novembre, résultat d'une santé négligée,
sacrifiée au feu ardent de sa passion pour ce
qu'il aimait plus que lui-même. Il aura
influencé la génération de mon père, la
mienne et nul doute que son souvenir contin-
uera de soulever les générations à venir. En
ce dimanche de novembre, au-delà des luttes
partisanes, des litanies nationalistes, et des
souvenirs malheureux des derniers mois de
pouvoir péquiste, chaque québécois sait au
plus profond de lui-même ce qu'il a perdu; et
le vide est d'autant plus grand que l'homme
était un géant.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THANK YOU

On behalf of the Yearbook Committee, I would like to thank the following people for their help in making the October 30 Coffee House a success.

Thanks to our brave and talented performers:

Diana Young
Seth Dalfen
Gordon Levine
Abdu Souraya
Wayne Condon
Cameron Young

Thanks also to all the volunteers who worked on tables, worked behind the bar, helped set up, baked, and moved equipment and furniture.

Special thanks to the dedicated few who helped with clean-up afterwards!

The event raised almost \$300 to help launch McGill Law's first ever Yearbook.

Teresa Scassa

* * *

SOCIAL COMMITTEE NEWS

Please note that functions of the Wednesday Activities Desk (info., ticket sales, etc.) will, after November 4, be carried out from the LSA Office rather than at the Porter's Desk. The times (12:00 noon - 2:00 p.m., Wednesday) remain the same.

CATS

For those wanting to walk to the Théâtre St. Denis from the Faculty, a group will *leave* from the Porter's Desk at 1:00 p.m. *sharp*!

N. Haensel

Are you hungry, thirsty, cold, lonely and in

need of a respite from harsh reality? Or simply looking for a good time? Drop by the Common Room at our weekly, Thursday afternoon (3:30 to 6:30 PM) "Happy House Coffee Hour" to dispel your respective negative state of being or entrench your positive one. A good time to be had by ALL, and we hope to see you there!!!

* * *

EXAMINATIONS

All Law Faculty exams are written by an examination number; these are now available at the Student Affairs Office.

Fall Term examination schedules are now available at the Student Affairs Office.

* * *

MONTREAL BAR PRIZE MOOT

This year's Montreal Bar Prize Moot will take place on Saturday, November 14, 1987 at 2:00 p.m. in the Moot Court of the Law Faculty.

This year's pleadings promise to be of a very high calibre, with a very distinguished bench presiding

All students and professors are invited and encouraged to attend. Your support for the moot is crucial in maintaining and building the reputation and prestige of this event.

LE TRIBUNAL-ÉCOLE DU MONTRÉAL BAR PRIZE

Le tribunal-école du Montréal Bar Prize aura lieu le samedi 14 novembre 1987 à 14h00 dans la salle de tribunal-école de la Faculté de droit de l'Université McGill.

La cour sera composée de membres distingués de la Cour supérieure et de la Cour d'appel du Québec et les plaidoiries seront comme à chaque année, d'une qualité exceptionnelle.

Étudiants et professeurs sont vivement encouragés à y assister. La poursuite et le prestige de ce tribunal-école a besoin de votre appui.

* * *

TALMUD CLASS

*Every Wednesday, 1:00 p.m.
Room 202*

Taught by former student Greg Bordan. Everyone is welcome, no background needed.

QUOTES OF THE WEEK

Overheard: Professor Jukier in Obs IA:

"Minors emancipated by marriage may perform certain acts without protection."

Mr. Casey in Corporate Finance:

Reflecting on recent market madness as a plot to purge the continent of yuppies:

"Question: What's the difference between a yuppie and a pigeon?
Answer: A pigeon can still afford to make deposits on a BMW."

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

IRWIN COTLER: MYTHS OR LEGEND?

Dear Editor:

Unfortunately, I own a T.V. set. If it weren't for the glass nipple, my enlightenment would have been aborted. I had the tube hot the other day and there was Irwin Cotler having high tea with the Queen, in my livingroom. When I changed the channel, and there he was again, shooting "oozo" with the Pope. At first I was confused...2 Irwin Cotlers, but then it dawned on me...he's a clone.

It makes sense, doesn't it? How could one man do so much good *and* teach a class in constitutional Law? He doesn't. They do. His superhuman (somewhat existential) legal omnipresence can only be understood within the context of duality: the dude's a production...but how? He'd never fit in a photocopier.

Is it a question of yin and yang? Is there the win of darkness, and the Irwin of light? Maybe he'll replace "Peg" Vachon... We asked his mother about her sons and Mrs. Cotler said, "Well, we were hoping for twins, but the Lord didn't come thru, so we had him cloned."

The theory would also explain Dr. Cotler's famous recurring exam. Some call it laziness, but I know better. "Irwin negative" doesn't know "Irwin positive" had already given it. The left lobe doesn't know what the right one is missing.

But how can one tell which of the two otherwise indistinguishable androids is in the room during the lecture? Is there no subtle twitch, no glassy-eyed stare, perhaps a hair out of place, that tips off the average, reasonably, diligent, bland student (that's you) which is Cotler? No.

Irwin Cotler: a metaphor for human reproduction in our time.

Murder-by-Law

By Teresa Scassa

XVI.

Tracy was sitting at one of the desks in the library. She was desperately trying to make sense of the readings for her course in Advanced Contracts. She found that all she was managing to do was to streak all the pages with bright yellow highlighter. She felt like a toddler with a rather vacuous approach to colouring.

Her attempts at studying were interrupted when Tony Armado, the law journal editor, appeared at her elbow.

"Tracy," he said, stating the obvious.

"Yes?"

Next week: Dr. Bridge's heart-breaking rejection by "Footlight Review" and why Toopé changed his name.

82175510
(Charles O'Brien)

* * *

(Dear Ms. Scassa:
In response to your very valid complaints, we agreed during our second coffee break to suspend the publication of Mr. Urbas' article so that you may rebut his slanderous and disparaging remarks about caffeine. - The Editor)

Dear Editor:

I must take exception to last week's article entitled *A Coarse White Substance*. In it, the author made several observations about caffeine and its users which I found offensive.

To begin with, Mr. Urbas linked the use of

"I want to have a word with you."

Tracy hoped that she could supply the word. She could think of several good ones.

"Should we go somewhere we can talk?" he asked.

"We're already in the library," Tracy pointed out. "What do you want to talk about?"

"About your stupid investigation"

Tracy heaved a martyred sigh. She lacked the energy to protest.

"You'd better tell that moronic editor to quit his insinuations," snarled Armado.

"Which moronic editor?" inquired Tracy.

Armado's dark complexion became tinged with purple. Tracy reflected that it now matched the library decor.

"You know who I mean," he steamed. "I hear I'm a suspect in this murder thing. That's garbage. I'm no killer. If he doesn't back off I'll rip his head off and stuff it back down his neck."

Tracy found the argument convincing. "OK," she said.

"I mean it," persisted Armado. "It's just his way of trying to make the journal look bad. We have a big issue coming up on the regulatory framework of secured interest registry structures. I don't want him cutting into our distribution."

Tracy assured Armado that nothing Jack could say or do would affect the popularity of that particular issue.

"I'm not a bad guy," Armado informed her, in a tone that defied contradiction. It's just that when people make me angry I want to obliterate them. You know how it is. It's like

Cont'd on p. 5

Cont'd on p. 4

Quid Novi is published weekly by students at the Faculty of Law of McGill University, 3644 Peel Street, Montreal, H3A 1W9. Production is made possible by support of the Dean's office and by direct funding from the students. Opinions expressed are those of the author only. Contributions are published at the discretion of the editor and must indicate author or origin.

Editor-in-Chief Joani
Rédactrice-en-chef Tannenbaum

Associate Editor Normand
Rédacteur adjoint Perreault

English Editor Brad
Rédacteur anglais Condon

French Editor Jeanne
Rédactrice française Cadorette

Production Manager Ron
Directeur de gestion Lauenstein

Staff/ Membres

Terry Pether
Phillip Pike
Teresa Scassa
Mark Segal
Dan Urbas
Steve Woodman
David Wallbridge

Quid Novi est une publication hebdomadaire assurée par les étudiants de la faculté de droit de l'université McGill, 3644 rue Peel, Montréal, H3A 1W9. La publication est rendue possible grâce à l'appui du bureau du doyen, ainsi que par le financement individuel des étudiants. Les opinions exprimées sont propres à l'auteur. Toute contribution n'est publiée qu'à la discrétion du comité de rédaction et doit indiquer l'auteur où son origine.

Murder-by-Law Cont'd from p. 3

this guy once," Armado seemed intent on communicating feelings. "He used to joke about footnotes. He made one joke too many."

"What happened?" inquired Tracy with trepidation.

"I hurt him pretty bad," confessed Armado. "I got a citation."

When Armado had gone, Tracy tried to return to her studies. Her train of thought, already running at a huge operational deficit, was soon derailed by yet another intervention.

"Tracy!" exclaimed Lily, "Are you working?"

Tracy turned to face her friend, "I'm in the library, aren't I?"

"Oh good! I was afraid you'd be busy."

Tracy sighed and closed her books. "What do you want?"

"Guess what?" asked Lily gleefully. "Guess what Frank Butler did?"

"Dallas?" inquired Tracy cynically.

"Close," squealed Lily in delight. "He's going for dinner with Dinah!"

"Dinah the man-hater?"

"That's the one."

"How do you know?"

"I eavesdropped," explained Lily. "Isn't it wild?"

"It doesn't make sense. You've gone too far, Lily. That's one rumour I won't believe."

"It's not a rumour," pouted Lily. "It's true."

"It's impossible. Why would he want to go out with her?"

Lily giggled in delight, "I'm sure he did it on a bet with some of the other guys."

"That's so juvenile."

"We're talking about Frank Butler."

"True," admitted Tracy. "But why would Dinah go out with him?"

"Maybe she likes to be outraged," suggested Lily. "Maybe she thinks she can change him."

"If she could change him into a newt, we'd be making progress," observed Tracy.

"Actually," said Lily with the air of a sage conferring wisdom on a moronic but devoted disciple. "Actually, Tracy, there may be other reasons."

Tracy waited for the reasons. When they were not forthcoming, she signed and provided the desired cue. "Really? What could they possibly be?"

Lily smiled with conspiratorial delight. "Jack thinks that Frank and Dinah are accomplices in the murder. He thinks they might be 'up to no good' again. When he heard they were having dinner together he immediately suggested that we go out too. You know, to spy on them."

"We?" inquired Tracy.

"Well, I thought it would be all three of us but Jack felt it would be better if you lie low for a while. Do you mind?"

"Not at all." Tracy was admiring Jack's rather inspired move. He had finally managed to get a date with Lily. The real irony was that Lily, the Queen of Gossip, was completely oblivious to this fact. It was a major coup on Jack's part.

"Won't it be great?" sighed Lily. "We'll get to find out if they're plotting another grisly murder."

"And if they're not?" inquired Tracy.

Lily gazed at her wide-eyed. "If they're not," she explained in a tone she saved for total idiots, "then at least I'll be able to get all the dirt on their date."

THE DEFENSE ON THE DEFENSIVE

By Terry Pether

Last Thursday, well-known Canadian criminal lawyer, Edward Greenspan addressed a good turnout in the Moot Court. Invited by Forum Nationale, Greenspan brought along several copies of his newly-released book, *Case for the Defence* (\$27.95 Cdn, hardcover), co-authored by George Jonas. He hastened to indicate that all of the proceeds from the sale of this book will fund a scholarship, established in his father's memory, for graduate studies in criminal law. He didn't bother to mention who gets all of the publicity when this book becomes a bestseller.

Greenspan has been asked a million times how he can defend a guilty person. Al Capone's mother, he said, had a better understanding of what her son did for a living than Greenspan's mother has of what he does for a living. One time, when he accepted the case of a guy stuck for softcore video porn distribution, Greenspan received a caustic letter from some self-righteous, reactionary jerk, admonishing his complete lack of family values as a co-conspirator in the immoral scourge of pornography. *Case for the Defence* is Greenspan's attempt to explain (not, he emphasized, to justify) to all kinds of Canadians, lawyers included, the role of defence counsel.

According to Greenspan, the main issue involves the fundamental right of the accused to counsel. Making this point in his "explanation", Greenspan sounded over-rehearsed, even preachy. One could see that he has been over this stuff time and again, that he has argued tirelessly that the right to counsel is the "most significant manifestation of the state's regard for the individual." No person, asserted Greenspan, must face the awesome power of the state alone, no matter how obnoxious he is, no matter how strongly the finger of guilt points to his direction. And Greenspan has seen the awesome power of the state. For example, he said, much was made of the million dollars paid by wifekiller Helmut Buxbaum to Greenspan, Rosenberg. But, he pointed out,

the state spent five and a half million dollars to put Buxbaum away.

Continuing his "explanation", Greenspan conceded that he often defends "sons-of-bitches" because they are the people that many of our criminal laws are aimed at. And, Greenspan added, it is indeed the client he defends, not the crime alleged. For example, he would not defend a murder rap by trying to establish that the victim deserved it. But he believes that every client is entitled to expect every defence available. After all, he argued, our's is a democratic society in which the state's interests are not paramount. In Canada, there are rules by which the enforcers of our laws must themselves abide.

Greenspan recalled the time when he saw the film *And Justice For All*, right around the part where Al Pacino, piqued by some guilt of his own, blows the whistle on his guilty rapist client. The whole theatre cheered. Greenspan thought to himself, "who would want a lawyer like that?", a lawyer who believes along with the rest of society that fundamental procedural rights are mere technicalities that should spare no creep who's better off in jail.

Procedure is crucial. Greenspan reminded his audience that everyone is presumed innocent until proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Only hard evidence establishes guilt. Nothing else, not even confessions in the privileged lawyer/client context, should make the criminal lawyer judge his client. And if a defence attorney is unable to accept this, suggested Greenspan, he should find another line of work.

In submitting his theory, Greenspan was obviously emphasizing the "rule of law". He further seemed to imply that his listeners, as law students, if they at all appreciated his argument, should not be asking questions such as "How can you defend someone whom you know has committed a criminal offence?" As if there is only one, purely objective, form of guilt; i.e., that established beyond a reasonable doubt by sufficient and legally obtained evidence. And no other?

Even accepting (as I think most law students do) that the state must subject itself to certain procedural rules which safeguard the rights of the individual against arbitrary police powers and that every person accused of a crime has the right to retain counsel whose role it is to ensure that his client will not be deprived of his liberty on the basis of insufficient or illegally acquired evidence, the question remains. Forget the "rule of the law" stuff for a moment. "How do you, Mr.

Cont'd on p. 6

Letters to the Editor

Cont'd from p. 3

caffeine to irascibility and edginess. As a regular coffee drinker, I find such allegations extremely irritating.

Mr. Urbas also recounted the results of a scientific study linking caffeine intake with sterility in male rats and roosters. He/she seemed to be implying that this study would apply by analogy to male law students. This comparison, while appropriate in some cases, is very rude.

The author repeatedly implied that caffeine was more stimulating than classes, case-books and law in general. This is a truism. In any event, caffeine is not the only drug to have this effect. An overdose of valium can also be more stimulating than certain courses. In singling out caffeine, Mr. Urbas clearly shows his bias against what, to some of us, is clearly a wonder-drug.

The author also shows his/her bias against caffeine in his/her description of the side effects of consumption. He/she argues that it creates an adrenalin rush, quickens the heart rate and "stimulates the body." These effects are actually caused by sexual activity. People like Mr. Urbas should not be allowed to drink coffee in public.

Finally, I must take umbrage at the author's suggestion that we have a drug problem at the Law Faculty. That kind of allegation is sensationalism of the worst kind.

Teresa Scassa

P O T P O U R R I

A Moncton (CP) story gives an interesting curve to all those bicyclists who jump the lights. Seems John Bigelow, a 28 year old man, was acquitted on a charge of pedalling his 12-speed bicycle through a red light on July 7. The Crown prosecutor and a Moncton policeman were seemingly unable to prove that the red light would ever change to green, even though it was functioning properly. The Defence claimed that some lights are always red and argued, "All we know is that there was a red light. What's the driver supposed to do-wait until he's old and decrepit and can't move?" One wonders if the Montreal jay-walkers will use that defence.

The Defense on the Defensive Cont'd from p. 5

Greenspan, as a person who also happens to be a criminal lawyer, feel at the end of the day about knowing that someone who has confessed guilt to you has been acquitted, possibly even to repeat the same offence?" The answer to this question is really what students were after. Many tried, in different ways, for the answer. Greenspan pounced on them all.

I think Greenspan missed (or evaded) the point. Nobody was looking for an indictment of the system. Of course the rules must be preserved, without exceptions, even if that preservation causes acquittal of guilty people. But then, Greenspan would say, they are not guilty. Legally. So there is no such occurrence as defending a guilty person since that part come before the verdict. It's the "rule of the law" thing. And if we are to believe Greenspan, he is completely free from making moral judgements. I don't believe that. If his point was so obvious, why was Greenspan so defensive? Why did he not just say that being a criminal lawyer is sort of like being an undertaker - you have to have the stomach for it?

Sales were brisk after Edward Greenspan's presentation. For greater insight into Greenspan's ideas, borrow the copy of someone who bought *Case for the Defence*.

Afraid your mooting skills are deficient and that you could never persuade a court of *anything* in a few short minutes? Have no fear: Bill C-53 is here to ease your burden. Passed by the Commons in mid-October, this is the bill that will allow the SCC to decide motions for leave to appeal on the basis of written arguments alone. Apparently there are about 500 motions for leave to appeal annually and each one requires a thirty-minute hearing. Better work on those old factum writing skills; they might save you yet.

* * *

In a Barrie, Ontario Courthouse two weeks ago a yong man was given two sentences on the same day. He was first convicted of robbery and given 12 years in prison, and then had a brief wedding ceremony before being taken away for incarceration. Said his loving young 21 year old wife, "He's been sentenced to 12 years and life. Twelve years for armed robbery and to me for life."

* * *

Did you think those definitions were unimportant? Well, make sure you make judicious use of those Blacks because some words only make sense when they are defined by the proper authority. According to the Canadian Press, a Winnipeg video dealer was recently convicted on a 1985 charge of dealing in obscene tapes but was fined only \$5.00. The judge's rational was that it was only in June 1987 that the SCC defined "obscene", therefore the dealer could not have had access to the definition and therefore did not know that what he was dealing in was obscene. Query: Do you think you know obscene when you see it?

* * *

Finally, a little Southern Exposure for Supreme Court watchers. If you are worried about the effect of the American Senate blocking Robert Bork's nomination (58-42; incidentally, only the fifth time this has

happened in American history), here are a few items gleaned from the popular press to make your sleep more fitful.

- In a decision announced last week, the Court decided that the U.S. government cannot deny visitor visas to aliens because of their political belief. In another monumental step for freedom of speech, the justices tied 3-3, which means that a tie goes to the respondent, affirming the appeal court decision.

- Before going to the D.C. Court of Appeals, which Bork was said to have found "boring", he had a \$400,000.00 a year partnership with a Chicago firm.

- Bork is said (by *Time*, September 21, 1987) to believe that unless a clear constitutional right is violated, the majority through its elected officials may impose its will on the minority, even if judges consider the resulting laws to be insidious or unwise...he has argued that the American Constitution *only* protects political speech.

- On the other hand, he once wrote, in attacking a proposed civil rights law in 1963, that it would be regrettable if "justifiable abhorrence of a racial discrimination [should] result in legislation by which the morals of the majority are self-righteously imposed upon a minority". He called the law which forced hotels and restaurants to serve blacks a "principle of unsurpassed ugliness"

FISCALITÉ

MONTREAL - Selon une étude menée par le professeur Francois Vaillancourt du département des sciences économiques de l'Université de Montréal, il se trouve seulement un tiers des Canadiens assez courageux pour compléter eux-mêmes leurs rapports d'impôts. Au moins 40 pour cent des contribuables préfèrent payer une firme spécialisée pour le faire, et les autres s'en remettent à un parent ou à un ami.

Cont'd on p. 7

SOMEONE TO WATCH OVER ME:

JUSTICE EXAMINED

By David Wallbridge

Someone to Watch Over Me is like the Socratic Method: The movie begins with a simple fact pattern. A woman (Mimi Rodgers) witnesses a murder. She needs protection from a possible assailant. Enter a police officer (Tom Berenger) who is assigned to protect her. Seems simple enough? Maybe. But remember, the pivotal focus is justice.

Who is the woman? She's single, attractive, wealthy-a Manhattan blue blood. The policeman? A recently promoted, married man, a father of one-a mongrel from Queen's who owns only his instincts. Hence the film's thematic journey begins: From Queen's to Manhattan and back. From general worlds apart, to the specific reality of togetherness and into a world of unanswered questions that follow, always close behind. On route the ironies of relative justice become progressively clear: "a poor man leaves his family alone in the ghetto, to protect a rich bombshell, who's only concern is whether or not to testify at trial." Then again, this is a serious judicial determination, considering she might be murdered for her trouble!

More questions... The poor man and wealthy beauty *may* be romantically involved: A definite injustice from his dedicated wife's point of view, what with a cute child, in the urban jungle with only a gun in the bed between them. And who's lurking in the trash bin? Did I say gun?

In the final analysis, this highly entertaining story is a well produced picture. More precisely, the camera work parallels and reinforces the action on the screen. We enter rooms as we enter lives: "Watching over" from wide comfortable perspectives, we are pulled visually into the confines of close personal encounters. In the end, well, nothing is that simple...

WASN'T THAT A PARTY!

The Yearbook Committee wishes to thank everyone who made our October 30 Hallowe'en Bar a smash success. The live music and imaginative costumes really made the night and luckily, we have it all on film. If you weren't there, you missed your fellow law stuents at their best - masked and messy.

Proceeds raised from door admission contributions and the bake sale will help cover the start up and production costs of this Faculty's first ever yearbook. The Yearbook is actually a photo annual with (*intra alia*) group pictures of the various Faculty clubs and class pictures of each common and civil law year. The graduating students will be represented individually, the picture accompanied by a few words of their own. (*Note to the graduates:* You will be expected to make sure the yearbook has your photo otherwise your name will appear next to a blank space. Also, start thinking which words of wisdom you'd like to have recorded for posterity beside your picture. Forms will be distributed later in the year.)

In order to make this endeavour a first time success, we welcome your active participation and/or any ideas you may have. We have a mailbox in the LSA office. Also, please be supportive of our photographers - any more complaints about "flashes in the dark" will be met with mute indifference.

* * *

Le "Comité de l'Annuaire" tient à remercier tous ceux qui ont contribué à faire de notre "party d'Hallowe'en" un éclatant succès.

Les magnifiques costumes ainsi que la musique en ont fait une soirée mémorable, et par chance, nous avons pu filmer le tout. Si vous n'avez pu être présent vous avez manqué la chance de voir vos confrères dans leurs plus beaux attraits.

Les revenus provenant de la soirée ainsi que de la vente de gâteaux suivront à couvrir les frais de démanège et la production du premier "Annuaire" de notre très chère faculté.

"L'Annuaire" sera composé de photos individuelles ainsi que celle de chaque class (Droit Civil et Common Law) et sans oublier une photo de chaque club ouvrant au sein de la faculté.

Le finissants seront représentés individuellement et leur photo sera accompagnée d'un bref passage de leur remporition. (*Attention aux finissants:* C'est votre responsabilité de vous assurer que votre photo paraîtra dans l'Annuaire, autrement, votre passage voisinera une case vide. Donc, penchez dès à présent à un passage évocatuer que voudrez-vous laissé à la postérité... Des feuilles à cet effet vous seront distribués au cours de l'année.)

Cont'd on p. 8

Potpourri

Cont'd from p. 6

En outre, moins les gens sont scolarisés, plus ils ont recours à une aide extérieure pour faire leurs rapports.

Au moins 36 pour cent des Ontariens font eux-mêmes leur déclaration, tandis que seulement 27 pour cent des Québécois, qui ont deux formulaires à remplir, effectuent eux-mêmes cette tâche.

* * *

NEWARK - Un petit Américain de onze ans risque 20 ans de prison pour avoir brulé vif un homme qui dormait.

Le petit garçon, qui plaide coupable, s'est présenté à l'audience du tribunal supérieur de Newark, au New Jersey, accompagné par ses parents. Il a reconnu devant le juge qu'il avait volé de l'essence dans un garage et en avait arrosé Alvin Bable, 37 ans, qui dormait sur les marches d'une maison en construction. La victime, très grièvement brûlée, est morte à l'hôpital le lendemain.

Le procureur a déclaré qu'il avait été très ébranlé d'apprendre que l'avocat du petit garçon allait plaider coupable. Il a néanmoins précisé qu'il avait l'intention de demander une peine de 20 ans de prison.

The *Quid* feels it is our obligation to print the following ransom letter delivered to our office surreptitiously!

FRANK B.

WE HAVE The

IMPORTED Chair!

DEMANDS TO BE

FORWARDED TO The

Quid

AND

The New York Times



**THE MOST POWERFUL BRAINS
IN THE BUSINESS.**

What a Party!

Cont'd from p. 7

Afin de mener a bon port cette expédition et en faire un énorme succès, le "Comité" accueillera avec grande joie votre aide et/ou

vos idées ou suggestions. Nous avons un casier au local de l'Associatin étudiante.

Et en terminant, soyez coopératifs avec nos

photographes et du même coup soyez avisés que vos plaintes concernant la violation de votre vie privée nous liasseron! complètement indifférents...